

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 13-24 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM 24

The Examiner remarks that newly added claim 24 is not addressed in regards to the prior art of record, and that Applicant's reply filed on 2/19/2007 is therefore not fully responsive to the prior Office Action according to 37 CFR 1.111.

Claim 24 depends from claim 1 and should be allowed for the same reasons.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Spielberg (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0129057) in view of Caspi (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0250201). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies on Spielberg to teach annotating a pre-authored screenplay or book during a review process by speaking into an input associated with a device for reviewing the pre-authored screenplay, with or without any preexisting annotations provided by other reviewers. The Examiner also relies on Spielberg to teach that the preexisting annotations, if any, are filterable by reviewer/source. However, Spielberg does not teach, suggest, or motivate that the media is a media stream captured by camera units simultaneously operated by different cameramen at a shooting scene, that the tags are supplied by different cameramen via speech inputs of the camera units, or that the tags are filtered by cameraman.

The Examiner relies on Caspi to teach an annotation system in which different computer clients have different speech inputs, with tags supplied by those inputs being

labeled in order to indicate which client/user supplied which tag. However, Spielberg and Caspi do not teach, suggest, or motivate that the media is a media stream captured by camera units simultaneously operated by different cameramen at a shooting scene, that the tags are supplied by different cameramen via speech inputs of the camera units, or that the tags are filtered by cameraman.

Applicant's claimed invention is generally directed toward a collaborative media indexing system and method. In particular, Applicants' claimed invention is directed toward a collaborative tag handling system in which a media stream captured by camera units simultaneously operated by different cameramen at a shooting scene is tagged by tags that are supplied by different cameramen via speech inputs of the camera units, with the tags being filtered by cameraman. For example, independent claim 1, especially as amended, recites, "a first camera unit capturing the media and having a first speech input supplying speech of a first cameraman operating the first camera unit for defining a first tag in computer readable memory; a second camera unit capturing the media and having a second speech input supplying speech of a second cameraman operating the second camera unit for defining a second tag in computer readable memory; a tagging system for assigning each said first tag and said second tag to the media; and a collaborative tag handling system for dispatching each said at least one tag to a plurality of individuals for review based on cameraman, wherein each said first tag and said second tag includes a label identifying which of said first cameraman and said second cameraman provided the tag, and said first camera unit and said second camera unit are operated simultaneously to capture a shooting scene."

Therefore, Spielberg and Caspi do not teach, suggest, or motivate all of the limitations of independent claim 1, especially as amended. These differences are significant.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner allow independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with all claims dependent therefrom, including new claim 24.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 7, 2007

By: Gregory A. Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GAS/JSB/kp]